



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,555	07/19/2000	Thomas Richard Haynes	RSW9-2000-0016US1	2052
25259 75	590 06/03/2004		EXAM	INER
IBM CORPORATION 3039 CORNWALLIS RD.			CHUONG, TRUC T	
			ARTIBUT	DADED MED (DED.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			2174	13
			DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/619,555	HAYNES, THOMAS RICHARD				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Truc T Chuong	2174				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may by within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) No. cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirly (30) days will be considered timely. #ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 M</u>	<u>1arch 2004</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.					
, ===	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received.  Its have been received in  Its have been received in  Its have be	n Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	<b></b>					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	Paper I	ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2174

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 03/08/04.

2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent claims. In Amendment C, claims 1, 7, and 13 are amended. This action is made non-final.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,015 B1) in view of Internet Explorer Screen Capture ("Screen Capture", Figures 1-5).

As to claim 1, Bates teaches a method of logically navigating within a web site, comprising the steps of:

installing a direction indicator relative to reference link shown on a currently viewable page within the document on the web site (a plurality of identifiers, col. 2 lines 54-59, col. 3 lines 30-35; any other descriptive information for a particular document trail that serves the highlight of the document trail may be included in addition to or in lieu of a title and color, e.g., a text description, an icon or image, a sound clip, an animated icon, etc., col. 6 lines 25-55, col. 7 lines 60-65; and a colored icon 240 may be provided to

Art Unit: 2174

indicate that the link will navigate to the next document, col. 15 line 59-col. 16 line 3, fig. 11);

surfacing said direction indicator prior to selection of said reference link (a user positioning a mouse pointer over the display representation of a hypertext <u>link</u> definition that specifies as its URL a document, col. 17 lines 34-36) within the currently viewable page within the multi-page HTML document (figs. 10-11 show a current viewable page within the multi-page HTML document, and col. 15 lines 16-67); although, Bates shows a plurality of identifiers, which may be included such as colored icons, images, animated icons, etc. as mentioned above for a particular related document in navigating related links within the current web site, Bates does not clearly state that the link is logically forward or backward relative to content within the currently viewable page within the multi-page HTML document. Screen Capture shows tool tips with arrows to indicate surfacing directions to inform the user whether said link is logically forward or backward within a current web site (tool tip 2 of fig. 3), which provides "Backward" and "Forward" buttons (element 2 of fig. 2 and element 3 of fig. 3) from Internet Explorer Browser (figs. 2-3). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to modify the Screen Capture tool tips in the active Web document trails of Bates to provide visual tools in tracking navigation information relating to the current web site.

As to claim 2, Screen Capture teaches a direction indicator is an arrow (Arrows of Backward and Forward buttons, elements 2 and 3 of figs. 2-3).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 4, Bates teaches step of surfacing said direction indicator comprising hovering a pointing device over said link. This is individually similar in scope to claim 1 because "a user positioning a mouse pointer over the display representation of a hypertext <u>link</u> definition that specifies as its URL a document" (as mentioned in claim 1 above) means before mouse click to make a selection of the link.

As to claim 5, Bates in view of Screen Capture teaches a toggle capability to only allow an indicator in one direction (Only show Backward button 4 of fig. 4).

As to claim 6, Bates teaches of using suitable HTML-compatible tags (col. 6 lines 45-55); and Bates in view of Screen Capture inherently teaches the step of extending an HTML tag language by addition of an attribute for an HTML BODY tag because of any HTML source code in order to operate expressing a current status of an event (or the movement backward/forward as mentioned in claims 1-2, 3-5 above) must have in the HTML source code a tag (or a function call, a procedure, a parameter, etc.) to detect a change to that indicator based on structure of each Web site link.

As to claims 7, 8, and 10-12, they are system claims of method claims 1, 2, and 4-6. Note the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 4-6 above respectively.

As to claims 13, 14, and 16-18, they are program product claims of method claims 1, 2, and 4-6. Note the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 4-6 above respectively.

5. Claims 3, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,557,015 B1) in view of Internet Explorer Screen Capture ("Screen

Art Unit: 2174

Capture", Figures 1-5) as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14, and 16-18 above, and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,877,766).

As to claim 3, Bates in view of Screen Capture teaches that directions are bi-directional and predetermined prior to selection of link (see rejection of claim 1 above) and the arrows to show directions (see rejection of claim 2 above) but modified active Web document trails of Bates does not show the arrow points upward to indicate movement backward and said arrow points downward to indicate movement forward within the web site. However, Bates clearly demonstrates these features in his invention (e.g., 45 or 90 degree, col. 10 lines 46-56). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have this highly desirable direction indicator of Bates's navigation web structure in the modified active Web document trails of Bates to enhance visualization of a retrieve operation status (Abstract) based on different screen layouts, or display setups of a user.

As to claim 9, this is a system claim of method claim 3. Note the rejection of claim 3 above.

As to claim 15, this is a program product claim of method claim 3. Note the rejection of claim 3 above.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2174

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,908 B1) teach related links, a current web

page, hovering mouse, GUI, and navigation (cols. 5-9 and figs. 1, 9, 12-14).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Westine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Truc T. Chuong

05/26/04

Page 6